DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 229 CE 023 712

AUTHOR Tracy, Keith M.
TITLE Job Skill Training, Placement and Follow-up of Rehabilitation Clients in Utah Sheltered Workshops.
INSTITUTION Utah State Board for Vocational Education, Salt Lake City.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 104p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academically Handicapped; *Handicapped; *Job Placement; Job Skills; *Job Training; Program Improvement; Questionnaires; *Sheltered Workshops; State Surveys; *Vocational Education; Vocational Followup
IDENTIFIERS Utah

ABSTRACT

A study investigated skill training, job placement, and follow-up services for the vocationally handicapped of sheltered workshops in Utah. Two questionnaires were developed, one to ascertain pertinent data about clients from the sixteen workshops of Utah and the other from the placed clients, for validation purposes. All but one workshop responded, providing information on 1,047 clients. The rate of response for clients was 45% Findings show 47% of clients in work activity or work adjustment modes. The three most active and productive areas, in descending order, were trade and industrial, distributive, and health occupations training and placement. More than one-third of clients were over sixteen and in skill training programs. Most clients were placed in a job relating to their skill training area and most were still on the job. Recommendations include teacher training for coping with the handicapped in the mainstream and in-depth studies of client follow-up services to placed clients, employees, and parent or guardian. Initiatives were suggested to provide for equal access into training, jobs, and upward mobility. (Questionnaires are appended.) (PV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181229

JOB SKILL TRAINING
PLACEMENT AND FOLLOW-UP
OF REHABILITATION CLIENTS
IN UTAH SHELTERED WORKSHOPS

Keith M. Tracy

Salt Lake City, Utah
August, 1979

CE 023 712

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Keith M. Tracy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

This study involved an investigation of skill training, job placement and follow-up services for the vocationally handicapped of sheltered workshops in Utah.

Two questionnaires were developed by the researcher, one to ascertain pertinent data about clients from the 16 workshops of Utah and the other from the placed clients, for validation purposes.

The workshop questionnaire was designed to elicit skill training, job placement and follow-up data about clients, along with other appropriate demographic information.

The client questionnaire was developed with client response in mind; a simple instrument which sought similar information as the workshop questionnaire. In addition, the client was asked to respond to questions regarding job preparedness, success and satisfaction.

Fifteen of 16 Utah workshops responded to the workshop questionnaire and provided data on 1,047 clients. The workshop responses included names, addresses and phone numbers of 322 clients trained, placed, and followed during calendar 1978 as requested.

Those clients were then surveyed with 115 responses completed. Forty-eight sets of survey materials were

returned by the postal service as nondeliverable. The rate of response, when considering those not delivered, was 45%.

The responses to both instruments were coded for computerization using the U.S. Office of Education Vocational codes. Two additional codes were assigned by the researcher to ascertain (1) those clients involved in work activity and work adjustment throughout Utah workshops, and (2) to determine clients who were involved in professional training and placement.

Forty-seven percent of workshop clients were found to be in work activity or work adjustment modes. Both workshop and client responses indicate Trade and Industrial, Distributive and Health occupations training and Placement as the three most active and productive areas for the vocationally handicapped, in descending order. Few clients were found to be in training and/or placed in Agriculture, Business or Office, or Home Economics Gainful occupations.

Few clients, in workshops, were under the age of 16. More than one-third of clients were found to be (or had been) in skill training programs. High percentages of trained clients were placed in a job relating to their skill training area, and a high percentage of placed clients were still on the job--according to the workshops. Clients however, indicate considerably fewer still on the job.

Though significant numbers of follow-up calls were made on client employers, few calls were made upon client parents or guardians, according to clients. Clients also indicate fewer calls made upon them than shown in the workshop data.

Sixty-one percent of clients were found to be in the learning handicapped category. One implication drawn from the study is that regular training programs are not designed with the learning disabled (or other handicapped) in mind. In addition, placed clients are found, for the most part, to be in jobs requiring minimal skills.

Recommendations include teacher training for coping with the handicapped in the mainstream and in-depth studies of client follow-up services to placed clients, employees and parent or guardian. Initiatives were suggested to provide for equal access into training, jobs, and upward mobility.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ABSTRACT		iv
LIST OF TABLES		ix
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		xi
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose of the Study	3
	Definitions	4
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
	Sheltered Workshops	7
	Skill Training	9
	Placement	13
	Follow-Up Services	17
	Summary	18
III.	METHODOLOGY	20
	Instrumentation	20
	Development of Workshop Questionnaire	21
	Development of the Client Questionnaire	23
	Procedure	24
	Data Analysis	26
IV.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE	28
	Client Involvement by Skill Training Category	29
	Client Focused "Output" Results	32
	Client Focused Follow-Up Services	35
	Categories of Clients by Handicapping Condition	37

Chapter Page

IV. (Continued)

Where Clients Have Been Placed in the Work Market 40
Workshop Commitment to the Study 43
Questionnaire Completion Data 44

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF CLIENT QUESTIONNAIRE 45

Skill Training 46
Placement Services and Job Status 49
Follow-Up Services to Clients 51
Job Satisfaction and Client Problems 56
Client Return to Workshop For Further Services 60

VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 62

Summary of Workshop Findings 63
Summary of Client Findings 65
Conclusions and Implications 68
Recommendations 71

Appendices

A. WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE 75

B. CLIENT QUESTIONNAIRE 81

REFERENCES 85

VITA 89

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	U. S. Office of Education Major Vocational Codes	22
2.	Client Involvement by Training Category (O. E. Code) For FY 1978 and 1979 as Reported by Utah Workshops	30
3.	Client Focused Output Results	34
4.	Average Calls Placed on Clients, Families and Employers During FY 1978 and 1979	36
5.	Workshop Clients by Handicapping Category--Frequency, %, and Range of Clients Enrolled FY 1979	38
6.	Where Clients Have Been Placed in the Work Market by Major O. E. Codes as Reported by Utah Workshops for FY 1978 and 1979	41
7.	Percentages of Client Responses by Workshop	47
8.	Client Responses to, "What Specific Job Were You Trained For?" by O. E. Code.	48
9.	Client Responses to, "Where Are You Working?" by O. E. Code	50
10.	Client Responses to, "What is Your Current Job?" by O. E. Code	52
11.	Client Responses to Family or Guardian Contact Related to Their Work	54
12.	Client Responses to Number of Calls Made Upon Client's Employer Relating to Client's Work	55
13.	Client Responses on Client Problems While on the Job	57

Table Page

14. Client Problems Not Related to Job Skills or Employer Relationships as Indicated by Clients 59

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researcher gratefully acknowledges the time and counsel of Dr. Charles Gregg, committee chairman, and the assistance of Dr. Gary Jorgensen and Dr. A. F. Faust, committeemen.

To members of the staff of the State Board of Education and State Board for Vocational Education, Drs. Vaughan Hall, David Gailey, and Harvey Hirshi and to Walter Ulrich and Blaine Petersen I extend my appreciation. Special thanks are very appropriate to Dr. Richard Keene, Research and Planning, for continued data, programming, and analysis support.

Appreciation is also extended to the directors and staff of the Utah workshops for the handicapped and their clients, without whose cooperation this study could not have been undertaken.

Special appreciation has been more than earned by my secretary and right arm, Ruth Frandsen, who assisted throughout the study.

To my wife, Eleanor, the steady and devoted helpmate, who has often deferred to her husband's aspiring needs, my very warm and enduring love.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study focused on skill training, job placement, and follow-up services to the vocationally handicapped in 16 public and private workshops of necessity outside the mainstream in Utah. The primary thrust of vocational rehabilitation throughout Utah and the nation has been the rehabilitation of the handicapped, needing services, for a productive role in society. It has long since been agreed that the need for a work role for most people is crucial. Agreed also is the same need for a productive life of the handicapped. "Recognition of the worth and dignity of the handicapped is traditional in our American way of life" (McGowan & Porter, 1967, p. 3). Most of America has recognized our social obligation to the handicapped; though barriers, frustrations and inequities exist throughout our society.

Add social obligation to the economic value of productive handicapped and the need for change becomes evident:

> In rehabilitation, the practical objective of restoring the individual to productive employment deftly intertwines with the humanitarian concern for the handicapped person's movement from abasing helplessness to a position of dignity and self-respect. (Thoreson, 1964, p. 12)

Vocational rehabilitation, from its outset, identified the goal of gainful employment. Later, "regulasions governing the vocational rehabilitation programs (1966) make specific provisions for job placement and follow-up of rehabilitation clients (McGowan & Porter, 1967, p. 130). Still later, we see the continued commitment of vocational rehabilitation leaders to rehabilitation for employment as paramount. "The central characteristic of vocational rehabilitation is that whatever service route the counselor and the client take, the objective is renumerative employment. Such an objective is clear, unequivocal, and inescapable" (Rusalem & Malikin, 1976, p. 193).

The initiatives towards a productive life for the handicapped, in terms of gainful employment, have been turned aside to some degree by those who see a stronger approach to the behavioral science aspects of rehabilitation. Yet, the motivation for productive employment remains strong. Sinick (1976) reminds us that without job placement there is no rehabilitation. Sinick also states the necessity of client and employer satisfaction as the result of an occupational role.

Federal legislation, Public Law 93-112, mandated that rehabilitation agencies become more accountable for providing services (Keate, 1977). More definitive information regarding client progress was being sought. According

to Keate (1977), until 1973 there was very little emphasis in looking beyond numerical and statistical reporting in evaluating how well the handicapped were being served.

A review of literature that pertains to the State of Utah reveals no studies that seek to determine the rate of job skill training and job placement of handicapped clients. One study by Keate (1977) sought to determine client satisfaction. No other resource could be found that deals with follow-up services to clients.

Purpose of the Study

Accurate and complete data is the core of objective analysis in most areas of inquiry. There appears to be little or no data relating to job skill training, placement relative to training and client follow-up regarding client satisfaction and success in Utah.

More specifically, these data are not available regarding the workshop, that is, by client necessity, outside the mainstream in Utah. Yet such information is required, if we are to determine progress for the vocationally handicapped served by the workshop in the State of Utah.

The purpose of this research, therefore, was to determine the status of handicapped clients being served by Utah workshops during a recent defined block of time (calendar year 1978) relating to skill training, job placement and

follow-up services to insure success. The overall purpose was to develop baseline data necessary to determine progress for the vocationally handicapped of Utah served by workshops.

Definitions

1. Sheltered workshop. A place where clients learn to work well enough to become employable within, and hopefully outside, the workshop. "Sheltered" implies a protective environment of the type most suitable for client training and work success.

2. Terminal workshop. A workshop that provides non-competitive, sheltered employment for persons who have some capacity for productive work but who for the large part, will not be able to function adequately in a competitive setting because of the nature of their handicapped conditions.

3. Transitional workshop. A workshop that includes the terminal approach when necessary but provides counseling services to clients through vocational counselors and others. The explicit objectives of this workshop is the acquisition of salable skills and job placement. The workshop staff is primarily industrially trained.

4. Vocational adjustment workshop. A clinically oriented workshop which utilizes both the counseling relationship and the workshop program as rehabilitation instruments. This workshop stresses the interrelatedness of

vocational, personal, and social components of personality in the workshop program and realizes these factors to further vocational adjustment.

5. Comprehensive community center. A major center with multiple resources and services for clients depending upon client need, funding and community support. Such centers include the sheltered, transitional, and work adjustment approaches, settings and services. They may provide for prevocational and work activity needs. In general, they provide for client evaluation, skill training, job placement and follow-up services to clients. They may also provide additional support services such as therapeutic recreation, functional academics, physical therapy, speech therapy and other services as needed by clients.

6. Skill training. That skill training through which clients acquire successful skills. For purposes of this study "skills" are those work skills necessary for client success and production in a setting outside of the workshop.

7. Placement. That activity which interfaces clients with the work market after the acquisition of the necessary skills. Placement may be achieved by a client, counselor, other significant person, or a combination of these persons. Placement is usually in relation to skill training.

8. Follow-up services. Those services provided to clients, client's family, next of kin or a guardian, and

employers that aid the client in work adjustment and employment success.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

It has earlier been established, that the thrust of vocational rehabilitation in America has been the delivery of those services necessary for handicapped clients' productive role in our society.

The literature review offers a discussion of client job skill training based upon potential, placement, and follow-up services necessary for job success.

Before discussing the skill training, placement, and follow-up services to clients the sheltered workshop, will be addressed briefly.

Sheltered Workshops

"Since Adam and Eve left the Garden of Eden man has been required to earn his daily bread" (Osipow, 1973, p. xi). The mode with which we earn that daily bread and in what setting differs on a broad scale in America.

For many of the handicapped, learning skills necessary to succeed on the job are not possible in the normal classroom, shop or laboratory setting. In the case of the severely handicapped not only is a sheltered setting important, it could be out of necessity, a terminal work

setting. According to Gellman and Freidman (1965):

> Two changes in workshop approaches are occurring simultaneously--the transformation of the terminal workshop into the "transitional workshop" and the shift from the transitional workshop to the "vocational adjustment workshop" which stresses psychological know-how and a clinical approach to vocational rehabilitation. (p. 34)

The terminal, or sheltered workshop, the first to appear on the scene, is still part of the rehabilitation movement. The conclusion of Chouinard and Garrett (1956) was:

> The workshop (sheltered) essentially is still a special place in which disabled people, unacceptable or unready for competitive employment but capable of some productivity, enter work activity. (p. 7)

The concept of the transitional workshop became prominent in 1958 during the Bedford Conference. This concept stresses the workshop as a bridge to competitive employment (Thompson, 1958). During this conference E. B. Whitten (1958) presented a third model, the vocational adjustment workshop, which can serve as a clinical tool for treating the employability problems of disabled people. The later definition of workshop includes Whitten's theme of using the work setting as an instrument for changing individuals. The Committee on the Development of Standards for Workshops of the National Association of Sheltered Workshops (Thompson, 1960) defines a workshop as a:

> . . . work oriented rehabilitation facility with a controlled working involvement and individualized vocational goals, which

> utilizes work experience and related services for assisting handicapped persons to progress toward normal living and a productive vocational status. (p. 5)

Today across the nation models of terminal, transitional, and work adjustment workshops flourish everywhere. And a further special setting has been added, the evaluation center, or workshop. The evaluation workshops seek to find the client's potential for various job skills, through simulation activities and testing.

The variation of workshop types throughout American is significant. Some are terminal in nature and cater to the more severely handicapped who strongly need the sheltered setting. Others are oriented to the transitional model of operation. Still others are work adjustment or work evaluation in operational mode. Then there are larger more comprehensive workshops that include varying degrees of one or more types of operation. Large comprehensive centers occasionally contain most of all the current modes of client services (for example, the Columbus Center of Salt Lake City, Utah). These centers provide a broad range of services that include the various settings and approaches needed by clients including skill training, placement, and follow-up services.

Skill Training

The advent of client job skill training in a workshop setting or in a work surrounding arranged by the work-

shcp assumes client readiness for training. Prior to skill training the counselor will have accomplished several services in behalf of the client. The counselor will have derived a vocational history.

> Through recording and studying a client's vocational history, the counselor can begin to acquire an understanding of the client's vocational aptitudes, his occupational skills and work habits through past employment, as well as his vocational interests. (McGowan & Porter, 1967, p. 80)

Occupational choice is dependent upon client aptitude, skills, interests and past work history. Occupational choice is also dependent upon the client's current disability. McGowan and Porter (1967) suggest that an accurate determination of whether past skills are currently sufficient in view of client handicapping conditions and limitations as being of pre-eminent importance.

Job readiness is defined as the attainment of performance patterns that will conform to those required by a work environment (Bitter, 1968). Before a client can be determined to be job ready, appraisals of his performance patterns as compared to those required by the work environment must be conducted. Successful performance patterns are, of course, skills attained by the client either through past former training, on-the-job training, or while in the workshop setting.

According to Jarell (1972), "too frequently only those occupations requiring physical output are considered legitimate training areas by rehabilitation counselors" (p. 228).

Zytowski (1968) defined work as "an expenditure of energy." Such energy may be either physical or mental, therefore, care should be taken in the selection of training for the handicapped.

Jarell (1972) states that:

> Training for the individual whose disability has resulted in a dimunition of his ability to expend physical energy should be an occupation with primary emphasis on the expenditure of mental energy. Likewise, for the individual whose impairment has resulted in a dimunition of the individual's capacity to expend mental energy the training emphasis should be physical output. (p. 228)

Types of rehabilitation training for clients have been stated to be four in number (Jarell, 1972); personal adjustment training, prevocational training, compensatory training, and vocational training. And, according to Jarell (1972), "to be effective, training must be individualized for each client if it is to serve the function of preparing clients to enter the labor market and provide marketable skills" (p. 230).

Hamilton (1950) feels personal adjustment training is that kind of training used to assist in the development of habits, attitudes, insights, and skills needed to succeed on the job.

This kind of training is now called work adjustment and should be used for the client who needs a better understanding of the workaday world. This is especially the case with a client who has not had the opportunity of

interfacing with paid employment.

In prevocational training the client is encouraged to explore, to determine himself what latent skills he has and find out those skills in which he will need to develop competency. Such skills are in addition to job skills and knowledge, as indicated by Lane, Soares, and Silverstone (1970) and Hamilton (1950).

Compensatory skill training, referred to by Jarell (1972), as basic in survival skills, include lip reading, speech training, gait and mobility training usually specific in nature. This training may be needed if the client will be entering and receiving maximum benefit from a formalized training program or in the competitive work market.

Vocational training is defined by Hamilton (1950) as that kind of experience which equips the person with skills to do something for which someone will hire him. Vocational training differs from other types of rehabilitation training in that it provides specific occupational knowledge and skills required within an occupation (Jarell, 1972).

If training is confined to one of these discussed areas, the possibility of client recidivism could be great, depending upon the client and his needs. Each client as an individual has different needs, therefore, a well-planned and coordinated approach to skill training should be based upon a comprehensive evaluation of the client's

needs: social, economic, medical, educational, psychological and vocational. This approach will ensure, to the degree possible, successful client rehabilitation.

Placement

The goal of vocational rehabilitation as has been previously emphasized, is placement in a job. The placement review will briefly include placement as a client need, service and process outcome. With regard to need, according to Sinick (1976),

> It is true that rehabilitative services toward nonvocational goals might benefit clients whose potentials or values are not consonant with employment. But most clients would like to work and are capable of working. The general aim of vocational rehabilitation is, therefore, almost universally applicable. (p. 195)

Sink, in an article for The Journal of Rehabilitation (1977), concludes that rehabilitation:

> . . . will retain the major goal from which the entire rehabilitation process has been developed. That goal--vocational and social independence for all who have desire and potential--is one with which no one may disagree. (p. 40)

Doane and Valente (1977) in relating the nation's handicapped state:

> Many of these men and women persist, however, in their desire, drive, and potential to achieve personal independence and success on a specific payroll job. (p. 45)

Further, Doane and Valente continue, "many of them have ample ability to function excellently in the competitive labor market" (p. 45).

In relation to placement as a service or process, Gellman (1968) points out "that the process begins with the need for rehabilitation and continues until the client functions (on the job) at an optimal level" (p. 99). This process includes, of course, placement as a process and a service.

Dawis (1967) in discussing the Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation, said "while seemingly parapatetic, these studies did touch on one common issue; the problem of placement" (p. 2). In further discussion, Dawis stated, "the theory of work adjustment is essentially a placement theory. It views work adjustment as being facilitated by and resulting from the placement of individuals in appropriate jobs" (p. 4).

Hardy (1972) views vocational placement of clients as:

> One of the most substantial contributions that a rehab counselor can make which affects his client over all mental and physical adjustments is the placement of the individual on a job that is well suited to his abilities and interests. (p. 236)

The same thing is true for the client in a workshop setting, regardless of whether this service is provided by the rehab counselor or significant others in the workshop.

Placement as a process must also be viewed in relation to a client's vocational behavior (work adjustment). Lofquist and Davis (1969) discussed a "science of vocational behavior" which they see as essentially vocational psychology. Lofquist and Davis (1969) see the neces-

sity for the full development of vocational behavior study, as a science, as an extremely important effort with relation to placement.

Anyone interested in developing expertise in placement, whether counselor, workshop director, or other staff, should avail themselves of major studies in vocational rehabilitation accomplished at the University of Minnesota beginning in 1957 by Weiss, Davis, Lofquist, and England. Above all, whoever interfaces with clients needing placement service, that person must be able to understand the "work personality" of the client (Hardy, 1972).

Placement viewed as an outcome by Hardy (1972) addresses in part the difficulty faced by counselors and others regarding basic loyalty to client, or employer. The question is whether the counselor, or significant others, should be protective of the client when dealing with the employer or protective of the employer. Hardy (1972) arrives at a conclusion that the relationship between himself, client, and employer is trilateral, not bilateral, and "as such, the counselor or other owes equal professional responsibility to both the client and prospective employer" (p. 236).

In terms of client outcomes, the counselor or significant others (for example, workshop personnel) are obliged to also assume equal responsibility for both the client and employer and the client's family or guardian. If he does

not, he could very well lose credibility with the client, employer, or client's family or guardian and perhaps cause further difficulty in jeopardizing the client/employer or family/guardian relationship.

The client as a partner who assumes important placement responsibilities was emphasized by Salomone (1971). Among the reasons for this approach was client job longevity which is an important outcome. Other outcomes, self-esteem and a sense of independence, are also enhanced.

Success and failure, on the job, are outcomes, though they may also be considered within the concept of process, when temporary in nature. Deno (1965) viewed return to school (workshop) and utilization of (other) community resources as desirable steps in the rehabilitation process. Here recidivism is not viewed with permanency, but rather, as a means of work experience. Criswell (1968) saw placement and job follow-up as a transitional experience for his clients. Gibson (1973) goes further and proposed that training programs be open-ended to allow for client trials and return to training.

Keate (1977) concludes in his unpublished thesis,

> While a number of states have recently adopted systems for measuring rehabilitation outcomes, there appeared to be no widespread consensus on what needed to be measured or which rehabilitation outcomes were most important to identify. (p. 20)

Keate's work involved the analysis of a client satisfaction

questionnaire developed by the Utah Division of Rehabilitation Services.

According to Keate (1977), most state agencies were doing post--closure, follow-up studies when confronted with the issue of measuring the impact of service programs, and client attitudes and satisfaction. A few agencies attempted to ascertain pre and post functional measures of client status. Other agencies were taking a look at client attitudes, opinions, and self concepts.

Keate (1977) also reminds us there are no federal guidelines as to how the measures of program evaluation should be developed. The same appears to be true with relation to state guidance. Literature regarding local workshops and their client outcomes within the state of Utah appear also to be nonexistent.

Follow-Up Services

Follow-up services to clients after placement are often of critical importance. According to Sinick (1977), "follow-up is indeed essential, not as a statistic or static phase of the rehabilitation process, but as a continuing service to clients" (p. 21). Sinick also strongly indicates that follow-up needs to be more comprehensive than merely a check on whether the client is still on the job. According to Sinick, "job satisfcation and satisfactoriness require verification--follow-up needs to be systematic and it also needs to be personalized to clients, their

employers and families" (p. 21).

As defined during the Ninth Institute on Rehabilitation Services (1972) "follow-up services are a part of placement services, insuring employer satisfaction with work performance and client satisfaction with the job" (p. 83).

Frequently it is considered that the significant persons; be he counselor or others, job is done with client job placement. However, follow-up involves considerably more time, effort and skill. Hardy (1972) indicates, "follow-up involves the counselor's ability to work as a middle-man between employer and client in order to help the client solve problems related to his handicap which may arise after being hired" (p. 252).

Hardy (1972) also states:

> In addition to the worker's service to the client during the follow-up, this period can offer real public relations opportunities for the counselor, especially when the employer notes the interest with which the counselor follows his client. (p. 252)

Follow-up frequency varies according to client need, agency regulations, employer and other feedback.

Summary

Sheltered workshops, from a developmental frame of reference, were reviewed. The development of sheltered workshops was shown to be variable in nature, according to client need and workshop leadership direction.

Skill training for clients in terms of job readiness, occupational choice and selection of training for clients were discussed. Types of training relating to client need by categories were addressed.

Placement was reviewed as the goal of vocational rehabilitation, in light of client need and motivation to be productive. Placement was also discussed as a service and process and as a substantial contribution to client success.

Viewed as an outcome, placement oftentimes becomes difficult due to the need for equal responsibility to client, employer and family on the part of counselors and/or significant others.

The client as a partner in the placement process, and success or failure in a job as outcomes were reviewed. The measurement of rehabilitation outcome and the lack of widespread consensus on what needs to be measured as discussed by Keate (1977) were viewed, as was the dearth of federal and state guidelines on program measurement. Client outcome measurement in Utah is apparently very sparse.

Follow-up services to clients as a continuation process and its importance were addressed. Follow-up involves counselors or significant others as middlemen and public relations persons who can further their clients' success outcome and create inroads with employers for other trained handicapped clients.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study purpose was to establish baseline data regarding job skill training, job placement relative to training and follow-up services to the vocationally handicapped of Utah, after placement. The efforts were delimited to the 16 public and private "handicapped" workshops of Utah.

Instrumentation

It was determined that two questionnaires would be necessary, one for workshop personnel to complete, the other for client completion. It was felt that the client response was important for validation purposes. Therefore clients who received skill training, job placement, and follow-up services, during a specific block of time were solicited for appropriate input.

The instruments used in this study were developed by the researcher. Input to instrument design and content were sought from State vocational rehabilitation staff and selected directors and other staff of local workshops as appropriate. Research indicated no current available instrument that would satisfy the needs of this inquiry.

Development of the Workshop Questionnaire

The workshop survey questionnaire begins with the federal definition of "vocationally handicapped." This questionnaire (Appendix A, p. 75) consisted of five sections that addressed: (a) client involvement by training category, (b) client focused "output" results, (c) client focused follow-up services, (d) handicapped categories, mental and physical, of clients, and (e) information on where clients have been placed in the work market.

In the sections I and V the information sought was in terms of U. S. Office of Education major vocational job codes (i.e., 01 Agriculture, 04 Distributive Education, etc.) (See Table 1, p. 22). Sections I, II and III included questions which required short answers, yes or no, or a check mark in the appropriate space. These questions related to specific and important information about workshop mode, staff and services. Instrument sections I, IV and V included an "other" response category.

The information in sections I, II, III and V was on fical year 1978 and fiscal year 1979 to date (March, 1979). In general, frequencies counts in all sections were sought. Percentages based on frequency were then established.

The last segment (not designated) of the workshop questionnaire included three questions that required a yes or no answer. These questions, of strong importance, were designed to elicit a range of commitment on the part of

Table 1

U. S. Office of Education Major

Vocational Codes

Code	Occupation
01	Agriculture and Agri-Business
04	Distributive
07	Health
09	Home Economic Gainful
10	Industrial Arts
14	Business and Office
16	Technical
17	Trade and Industrial
20*	Other (Work adjustment, work activity, and work evaluation)
21*	Professionals

*Assigned or designated by the researcher only for the purposes of this study.

the workshop leadership regarding the study and their client information provided.

Finally, the questionnaire completer was asked to sign their name, give their title, and give the date of completion.

Development of the Client Questionnaire

The client questionnaire (Appendix B, p. 81) was developed with the goal of validating workshop information about their clients who were skill trained, job placed, and received follow-up services through their workshop.

The client survey instrument included 10 basic questions and subelements of questions relative to their skill training, job placement, and follow-up services provided by the workshop. Nine questions or subelements (i.e., 1.a.,b.,c., etc.) required yes or no indications. Two questions included the need for the client to write-in or otherwise indicate the name of their workshop for identification and other information purposes. Nine questions or question subelements were open-ended for appropriate responses. Two questions were designed as fill-in and check the appropriate space types.

Five questions or question units required explanation and were satisfaction, dissatisfaction, job success, or client problem in nature. Question number 10 and subelements was designed to learn the return-to-workshop rate and why.

The design of the instrument was purposefully simple to allow for maximum client response. The questionnaire included the facility of parent, guardian or friend response for the client in the case of client need. The client was encouraged to seek appropriate assistance where necessary.

Procedure

The directors of the 16 public and private workshops for the handicapped were telephoned and informed of the nature and elements of the study. Each was asked to support the study and provide the requested information. All 16 workshop directors indicated by phone, support for the study and provided the information as requested. Twelve of the 16 directors requested copies of the study for their information and use. The workshop questionnaire was mailed during the middle of February, 1979, to each workshop with an explanatory cover letter (Appendix A, p. 75). Each workshop was guaranteed client identification confidentiality. The workshops were asked to respond to the questionnaire by 9 March 1979. Each mail-out contained a stamped and addressed envelope for questionnaire return.

The response rate was anticipated to be about 75%. Fifteen workshops responded for an actual response rate of 94%.

The sixteenth workshop did not feel that the questionnaire pertained to them since they were not involved in "skill training programs" and the local rehabilitation

counselor was "responsible" for job placement of their clients. They, therefore, did not respond.

All 15 responding workshops provided a list of clients trained, placed, and being followed as requested. The lists contained names, addresses and phone numbers of their clients.

An attempt was made at this time to complete the client questionnaire by phone with a sample of each workshop clients. This effort did not succeed. The researcher tried to reach 56 clients by phone and finally succeeded in reaching eight, four of whom could not respond to the questionnaire because of handicapping condition or other extenuating circumstance. This will be discussed further in a later chapter.

The client questionnaire process and response was more involved. The client questionnaire was mailed along with an explanatory cover letter (Appendix B, p. 82) and with an stamped and addressed return envelope to all clients listed by workshops as trained and placed during calendar year 1978. A response was requested by 30 March, 1979. Total clients listed by the 15 responding workshops as trained, placed, and being followed was 322.

The client response rate anticipated by the researcher was 30-35% to achieve an acceptable reliability. By the target date 115 responses were received. Forty-eight mail-outs were returned for a number of reasons as indicated by

the U. S. Postal Service. This will also be discussed in a later chapter. The response rate of those mailed to clients (322) was 36%. The response rate of those received by clients (assuming receipt by clients if not returned) (274) was 45%. Considering the nature of the clients and according to the Division of Rehabilitation Services and the State Board of Education Research Division, the response rate was considered to be good. The returned mail-outs would also indicate the transient nature of the client population (Keate, 1977).

After the target response completion date, nine additional client responses were received. These responses were not utilized for the study since the primary data received had already been coded and computerized.

Data Analysis

Each workshop response was numbered 1-16 alphabetically and dated in terms of receipt by the researcher. Each workshop response was also coded using the U. S. Office of Education vocational categories in relation to Sections I and V of the workshop instrument. In addition, each workshop response was coded in regard to who (kind of personnel) completed the response.

The client responses were numbered sequentially by their workshop after alphabetization of the workshops. Each response was coded by the number assigned to the workshop as alphabetized. Each client response was also coded

in appropriate sections, with the pertinent Office of Education code that was indicated by their client response information. Thus, if a client responded to question number 3, "What specific job were you trained for?" as woodworking, such client was assigned the Office of Education code 17 which designates a Trade and Industrial occupation.

A search was made for applicable computer programs that could handle the workshop and client response information. The BMD1F2A contingency tables program developed by the Health Sciences Computing facility of the University of California--Los Angeles in 1977 was selected. This program had the facility of some change and adaptability, that was needed by the nature of the study questionnaires and response information.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE

This chapter is organized into eight sections which present the findings of the workshop questionnaire and a discussion of the results.

The sections are listed as follows: client involvement by training category; client focused "output" results; client focused follow-up results; categories of clients by handicapping condition; where clients have been placed in the work market; workshop commitment to the study--client information and agreement to client contact; and questionnaire completion data.

The results are discussed and presented in tables, which illustrate workshop responses regarding their clients for fiscal years 1978 and 1979 to date (March, 1979). The results are shown and discussed both in terms of frequency and percentages.

The workshops have been assigned the numbers 1-16 alphabetically by their name as commented upon earlier. Information regarding workshop number 13 is left blank since workshop number 13 did not respond.

The Office of Education major vocational codes (eight in number) are listed 01-17. Codes 20 and 21 were desig-

nated by the researcher for purposes of the study since there were no Office of Education codes for two categories of clients trained in or working in a workshop setting.

Code 20 included all clients as designated by their workshops as being involved in work activity, work adjustment, work evaluation or otherwise employed in the workshop (sheltered employment).

Code 21 included those clients trained by or through the workshop and placed in professional positions as the result of their training.

Client Involvement by Skill Training Category

Client involvement by training category in the various workshops as reported is illustrated in Table 2, p.30. This table shows 1,047 clients were involved in skill training in job categories 01-21 during fiscal 1978 and 1,011 clients during fiscal 1979 to March 1979.

As indicated, 487 or 47% of clients in all reporting workshops training programs were involved in the "other" training category (Code 20) which included work activity and work adjustment (during fiscal year 1978). Five hundred and sixty-five or 56% of fiscal 1979 clients in all reporting workshops were involved in training in the "other" category.

Two hundred and forty-three clients or 23% were in skill training programs which were trade and industrial in nature as indicating by reporting workshops during fiscal

Table 2

Client Involvement by Training Category (O. E. Code)

For FY 1978 and 1979 as Reported by Utah Workshops

Work-shop	Office of Education Major Job Code																	
	01		04		07		09		10		14		16		17		20*		21*		Total	
	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79
1																	62	65				
2															1	3	21	21				
3			13	19											8	20	76	87				
4			1								1					1						
5			115	61	20	22									117	74						
6			3	7	40	35									5	5	10	8				
7	3	1	1	3											1	1						
8			2												4		150	201				
9	24		70	61							12	4			60	65						
10															5	11						

Table 2 (Continued)

Work-shop	Office of Education Major Job Code																			
	01		04		07		09		10		14		16		17		20*		21*		Total	
	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79
11			4												5	1	60	76				
12							2	3							2	5						
13[a]																						
14																	78	83				
15															18	18	92	89				
16			6	9											17	11						
Totals	27	7	215	160	60	57	2	3			13	4			243	215	487	565			1047	1011

[a]No Response

*Designated by the researcher for study purposes only.

1978. Two hundred and fifteen clients, 21%, were in trade and industrial training during fiscal 1979.

The third largest block of clients were involved in distributive education, 215 or 21% during fiscal 1978, while 16% or 160 clients were involved in distributive education during fiscal 1979.

The fourth largest group of clients were training in health occupations. Workshop response indicates 60 clients or 6% were so engaged in fiscal 1978 while 57 or 6% were similarly involved to March of 1979. As shown in Table 2, p.30, significantly fewer clients were involved in agriculture, business and office, and home economics (gainful) on a descending scale in both fiscal 1978 and 1979. No clients were reported training in industrial arts or technical areas. In addition, none were reported training in professional areas during the same time frame.

Eleven of the 15 reporting workshops indicated having skill training programs, four stated they did not have formal skill training programs, however, clients were receiving training of an informal or on-the-job training nature and were receiving other workshop services.

Client Focused "Output" Results

Total clients enrolled by the 15 reporting workshops was 1,868 for fiscal year 1978 and 1,669 to March of fiscal year 1979. Total clients 16 years of age or older were reported in number as 1,835 in fiscal year 1978 and 1,646

in fiscal 1979. In both cases the numbers indicated as over 16 was 98% of total workshop enrollments.

Table 3, p. 34, illustrates client focused output results. Six hundred and thirty-four clients or 35% of those over 16 years of age were involved in skill training during fiscal 1978 as reported by 15 workshops. Six hundred and nine or 37% were in skill training programs during fiscal 1979 to March of 1979. Four workshops did not report in this area.

Job placements related to skill training show 261 or 42% during fiscal 1978 and 168 or 28% in fiscal 1979. Three workshops did not respond for fiscal 1978 and five did not respond for fiscal 1979.

The number of placed clients still on the job as reported by responding workshops were 204 or 80% of those placed in fiscal year 1978 and 167 or 99% of those placed thus far in fiscal 1979. Four workshops did not report in this section.

The number of clients placed who returned for additional services were 34 or 18% in fiscal year 1978 and 19 or 11% in fiscal year 1979. Five workshops did not respond here for fiscal 1978 and eight workshops did not answer for fiscal year 1979.

In addition, nine workshops indicated placement and job development personnel were a part of their workshop staffs. Six workshops, however, have no such specialists

Table 3

Client Focused Output Results

	FY 1978			FY 1979 (to 3/79)		
	N	%	NR*	N	%	NR*
1. Total enrolled over 16 years of age	1835	100	NA	1646	100	NA
2. Total clients in skill training programs and percentage of total enrollment over 16	634	35	4	609	37	4
3. Number of job placements relating to skill training and percent of those skill trained	261	42	3	168	28	5
4. Number of placed clients still on the job and as a percent of those placed	204	80	4	167	99	4

*Number of workshops not responding.

on staff.

Client Focused Follow-Up Services

In this study an effort was made to determine follow-up services to clients after placement had been affected. All reporting workshops had earlier indicated 261 clients placed in jobs out of skill training related programs in fiscal 1978 and 168 to date in fiscal 1979.

Further data shows 286 clients in fiscal 1978 and 272 clients in fiscal 1979 as receiving follow-up services by or through the workshops. The difference between those placed and those receiving follow-up services appears to be because additional workshop clients beyond those placed were receiving follow-up services in the form of calls on the client family or guardian. Two workshops did not report regarding follow-up services in fiscal 1978 and three workshops did not report for fiscal 1979.

Table 4, p. 36, shows the range of average number of calls made on clients, client's family and client's employer. The average calls made on clients after job placement by workshops (or through workshops) ranged from 2 to 104 during fiscal 1978 as reported by 13 workshops and from 2 to 12 during fiscal 1979 as reported by 12 workshops.

Average calls on client's family ranged from 1 to 24 in fiscal 1978 and 1 to 73 in fiscal 1979 with two workshops not reporting in both fiscal years.

Average calls made upon employers of clients ranged

Table 4

Average Calls Placed on Clients, Families and Employers During FY 1978 and 1979

	FY 1978	NR*	FY 1979	NR*
1. Range of average calls on clients by or through the workshop	2 - 104	2	2 - 12	3
2. Range of average calls on client's family	1 - 24	2	1 - 73	2
3. Range of average calls on client's employer	2 - 104	1	1 - 64	1

*Number of workshops not responding.

from 2 to 104 in fiscal 1978 as in the case of calls on clients. The range was from 1 to 64 for fiscal 1979. For each fiscal year of the study one of the reporting workshops did not respond in this area of the questionnaire.

The differences between these extremes (2 to 104) on clients and client's employer are explained in part by the method of reporting by workshops as versus the information requested. One workshop which reported 104 calls on clients and client's employers as a total for their workshop clients placed on the job rather than an average.

To the question, "Who provides follow-up services to clients from your staff?" six workshops responded that their placement officer provided services. Three workshops indicated their rehab counselor followed through and six workshops reported that "other" staff people interfaced with follow-up services for clients.

Categories of Clients by Handicapping Condition

Information on clients by handicapping condition was sought in the study. The workshop questionnaire included a working definition of the various categories of clients by handicap. Refer to the workshop questionnaire in Appendix A, p. 75.

Table 5, p. 38, shows client data by frequency and percentage and range of enrollment by handicapping category. The largest number of clients are learning disabled in

Table 5

Workshop Clients by Handicapping Category

--Frequency, %, and Range of Clients

Enrolled FY 1979

	Frequency	%	Range	NR*
1. Learning	1010	61	20-297	2
2. Sensory-communicative	79	5	2-70	7
3. Mobility	236	14	1-83	3
4. Energy	54	4	1-36	9
5. Manipulative Dexterity	133	8	2-92	7
6. Paroxysmal	135	8	2-52	5
7. Other	18[a]	1	18	14
	1665	100		

[a]Reported as blind.

*Number of workshops not reporting.

category. One thousand and ten or 61% with two workshops not reporting fall into the learning disabled category. The range of clients numbered from 20 to 279 according to workshop reporting information.

The next largest group of handicapped in the workshops was 236 or 14% in the mobility category. The range numbered by workshops was from 1 to 83 clients unable to ambulate or transport themselves. Three workshops did not respond.

Eight percent of clients in both manipulative dexterity and paroxysmal categories or 133 and 135, respectively, in numbers were indicated as the third and fourth largest groups of handicapped in the workshop setting in Utah. The range of clients in manipulative dexterity and paroxysmal categories was 2 to 92 and 2 to 52, respectively. Seven workshops did not respond as having clients in the manipulative dexterity category, and five workshops left the paroxysmal category blank.

Five percent or 79 clients were indicated to be in the sensory/communicative category. Reports were not received by seven workshops in this area and the range of clients by reporting workshops was from 2 to 70 clients.

Fifty-four clients or 4% were reported in the energy handicapped category by six workshops. The range in this category was from 1 to 36.

Eighteen or 1% of clients were reported in the "other"

category by one workshop. These clients are blind and it was felt did not fit into any of the categories as defined. Fourteen workshops did not report clients in the "other" handicapping condition.

Total clients reported in all responding workshops was 1,669. Total clients referred to by handicapping category were 1,665. Four clients were not reported in any of the presented handicapping categories.

Where Clients Have Been Placed in the Work Market

As reported by workshops and by Office of Education category for fiscal years 1978 and 1979, placement is shown in Table 6, p. 41.

One hundred and ninty-four clients were shown to be placed out of 14 workshops in the various job code areas during fiscal 1978 and 161 during fiscal 1979 to March, 1979. Code 20 as designated by the researcher is blank since this category does not include placement into the regular job market. Code 20 includes clients in work adjustment, work activity and evaluation modes within workshops as shown elsewhere in this study.

As indicated by the data for fiscal year 1978 64 clients were placed in distributed educations, 61 in trade and industrial areas of work, and 57 in health occupations. For fiscal 1979, 57 clients were placed in trade and industrial occupations, 55 in health occupation areas, and 42

Table 6

Where Clients Have Been Placed in the Work Market by Major O. E. Codes

as Reported by Utah Workshops for FY 1978 and 1979

Work-shop	Office of Education Major Job Codes																	
	01		04		07		09		10		14		16		17		20*		21*		Total	
	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79
1	2	1	5	2																		
2															0	1						
3			6	5	6	2									4	1						
4			1												1	1						
5			19	6	21	9									18	10						
6			11	3	14	16									12	6						
7	5	4	2	4	1										2	1						
8			3												3							
9			4	1	8	22									5	7						

Table 6 (Continued)

Work-shop	Office of Education Major Job Codes																	
	01		04		07		09		10		14		16		17		20*		21*		Total	
	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79	78	79
10			3												2							
11		2		9		2										15						
12																5						
13[a]																						
14[b]																						
15			10	9	2	1									10	7			1	2		
16				3	3	3					4				4	13						
Totals	7	7	64	42	57	55					4				61	57			1	2	194	161

[a]No response.

[b]No job placements.

*Codes designated by researcher for purposes of this study.

Note. Does not include "other" placement(20).

clients were involved in distributed work.

Other placements for both fiscal years of significantly lesser number were 14 in agriculture, 4 business and office, and 3 in professional jobs. No placements were reported in the 09, 10, or 16 job categories.

No placements were reported for one workshop and one workshop as earlier indicated, did not respond to the questionnaire.

Workshop Commitment to the Study

The workshops surveyed were asked to respond to three questions regarding their range of commitment to the study and to their clients.

When asked if they were willing to provide back-up documentation to their responses in the survey questionnaire, all 15 responding workshops indicated to the affirmative.

To the question which asked for a list of names, addresses, and phone numbers of clients trained and placed from each workshop during calendar year 1978, the response was again affirmative. Fourteen workshops indicated yes, one workshop had no placements as all clients were involved in work activities.

The last workshop, as earlier indicated, did not respond to the questionnaire.

Fourteen workshops, therefore, provided lists of clients who received training and placement services

through their workshops. During calendar year 1978 these lists totalled 322 clients who would later be contacted to provide client responses.

When asked if their trained and placed clients as listed may be contacted to ascertain current status and success, 14 workshops involved in training and/or placement of clients indicated yes.

Questionnaire Completion Data

Questionnaire completion information was requested in terms of what type of individual by job category or position completed the survey.

Nine workshop directors completed and signed the returned questionnaire. Five placement counselors, job developers, or work adjustment supervisors interfaced with and completed the questionnaire. One director of vocational training completed the questionnaire for his particular workshop.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF CLIENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The workshops of Utah responded to the workshop questionnaire and provided lists of clients with addresses who were trained in their workshop setting, placed in the work market and followed, during the calendar year 1978.

The researcher then surveyed all clients as presented by the workshops to determine frequency of client training, placement, and follow-up services. Also surveyed were client readiness for work, job satisfaction and problems that might exist for the client.

Three hundred and twenty-two clients were surveyed. One hundred and fifteen responded by or close to the cut-off date for receipt for a response rate of 36%. Forty-eight questionnaires were returned for a variety of reasons according to the U. S. Postal Service. This will be discussed in a later section on implications. Two hundred and seventy-four clients were, therefore, assumed to have received the questionnaire. The response rate when considering this factor is 45%.

This chapter is divided into five divisions which present the findings and discussion of results. The results are discussed and presented in tables, which illustrate

client responses to the client questionnaire. Frequencies and percentages are shown as appropriate. Clients were numbered 1-115 as they responded, by their workshop alphabetically. Table 7, p. 47, shows the percentage of client responses by workshop as numbered alphabetically.

The U. S. Office of Education Major Job Code and those assigned by the researcher were used and each client response in pertinent sections was coded appropriately.

Nine questionnaires came in too late to be utilized in the analysis.

Skill Training

Client response as to whether they received training in a specific job role in the workshop was 66% yes and 34% no and 10 clients did not answer. When asked if they had received on-the-job training for a specific job role, 71% answered affirmative, 29% negative, and eight clients did not respond.

In the areas of both classroom and work setting training 73% of clients responded yes and 27% no with five no answers. Table 8 shows the number and percent of clients trained by major job codes as illustrated in Table 1, p. 22. Table 8, p. 48, includes a "0" code for those not trained for any specific job. When compared to the earlier response (above) it appears that a higher number of clients were not trained for a specific job than were indicated. Fifteen or 14% responding clients indicate no specific job training.

Table 7

Percentages of Client Responses

by Workshop

Workshop	%
1	4
2	0
3	10
4	2
5	34
6	16
7	4
8	3
9	6
10	2
11	5
12	2
13	0
14	0
15	4
16	8

Note. Total responses = 115.

Table 8

Client Responses to, "What Specific Job Were You Trained For?" by O. E. Code

Job Code	Number of Responses	%
"0"[a]	15	14
01	1	1
04	24	22
07	15	14
09	0	0
14	2	2
16	0	0
17	53	48
20[b]	1	1

[a]No specific code

[b]Other

The largest number of clients were trained in Trade and Industrial jobs by a wide margin, 53 clients, or 48%, of those responding to the survey. The next largest group were 24 or 22% trained in Distributive areas. Fifteen clients, or 14%, were trained in Health Occupations jobs and 1 and 2 clients, respectively, were trained in Agriculture and Business jobs. No client indicated that they received training in the 09 or 16 categories, and one client indicated training in the "other" category. Fourteen clients did not answer this question.

Placement Services and Job Status

An effort was made in this study to determine who was involved with the client placement. To the question, "Who helped you get a job?" 39% indicated their workshop staff aided. Thirty-seven percent said their rehabilitation counselor assisted. Five percent indicated Job Service helped, and 19% showed "others" as being more helpful. "Others" is construed to mean family members, friends, or perhaps the client themselves. Five clients did not answer this question.

When asked, "Where are you working?" 89 or 77% of responding clients indicated that they were working during the survey period, 26 clients or 13% were not working. Eight clients said that they were working within their respective workshops. Table 9, p. 50, illustrates where clients indicated they were working during the survey by Office

Table 9

Client Responses to, "Where Are You Working?" by O. E. Code

Job Code	Number of Responses	%
01	2	2
04	23	26
07	24	27
14	1	1
17	28	31
20[a]	3	3
+[b]	8	10

[a]Other

[b]Working in their workshop

of Education code according to client response. The number and percentages are based upon those who reported working.

Because of the varied nature of problems of handicapped clients, the question, "Are you still working?" was asked. This would seem repetitive, yet whereas in the prior question 77% of responding clients showed they were working, 73% said they were still working. The kind of response appeared to be based upon the way the clients perceived these two questions. Three clients did not respond to this question.

When asked, "What is your current job?" 84 clients or 73% of respondents indicated jobs in the various Office of Education codes by their nature as seen in Table 10, p. 52. Job concentration is shown to be Trade and Industrial, Distributive, and Health Occupations, or 50%, 29%, and 14%, respectively. One percent are shown to be in Home Economics gainful occupations, one percent in Agriculture, two percent in Business and Office occupations, and two percent indicated working within their own workshop "other."

Follow-Up Services to Clients

Since follow-up service to the client often has a strong bearing on the client's success on the job, information regarding follow-up services to the clients of this study was sought. Eighty-eight clients responded to the question regarding whether workshop contact had been made

Table 10

Client Responses to, "What is Your Current Job?" by O. E. Code

Job Code	Number of Responses	%
01	1	1
04	24	29
07	12	14
09	1	1
14	2	2
17	42	50
20[a]	2	2

[a]"Other" category

to them, their family, and their employer. Fifty-five clients, 63% of those responding to this question, said yes and 33 or 37% of respondents said no. Twenty-six of the survey respondents did not answer this question.

Table 11, p. 54, illustrates the number of calls made upon client's family or guardian regarding the client's work. Forty-two percent of clients indicated no calls were made upon their family or guardian regarding their work, 14% indicated one call, 11% two calls, 6% and 7% said four and five calls, respectively, were made upon their family or guardian. Four percent responded that six calls were made and three percent indicated nine calls.

Calls upon client employers are shown in Table 12, p. 55. Seventy-five clients responded, 40 did not. Thirty-seven percent indicated no contact (to their knowledge), 35% showed 1-3 calls made upon their employer, and 20% indicated 5-6 calls. Six percent said 7-9 calls upon their employers were made. The number of non-respondents, 40, to this question would appear to be because some clients did not know, or were not aware of follow-up calls made upon their family or guardian or their employer. If a client was doing well on the job his employer may not indicate that a follow-up call on his behalf had been made. The same could be true on calls regarding family or guardian depending upon the client's situation. The same assumption can be made for some of the 37% of clients who

Table 11

Client Responses to Family or Guardian Contact Related to Their Work

Number of Calls Made to Family or Guardian	Percent of Clients Responding
0	42
1	14
2	11
3	11
4	6
5	7
6	4
9	3

Table 12

Client Responses to Number of Calls Made Upon Client's Employer Relating to Client's Work

Number of Calls Upon Client's Employer	%
0	37
1	9
2	15
3	11
4	3
5	9
6	11
7	3
9	3

indicated no calls had been made upon their employer regarding their work. Implications regarding follow-up services for clients will be discussed in a later section.

Job Satisfaction and Client Problems

Eight-five percent of respondents answered yes to the question, "Are you happy in your work?" Fifteen percent said no, and 16 clients did not respond to this question. Why clients are not happy is shown as follows: six clients indicated they were not working and, therefore, were not happy; four respondents desired training in another, better job or better-paying position; three clients said their work was boring and that they had a hard time getting along; three responded as not being happy but did not indicate why. Other dissatisfied responses included, "other workers are rude," "didn't like night work," "not what I was trained to do," "not able to be on my own." Some other responses included difficulty with foreman or supervisor and trouble with anxiety and depression regarding their work.

Respondents showed a different pattern when asked the question, "Have you had any problems while on the job?" Thirty-six percent indicated yes and 64% said no, while eight did not answer.

Table 13, p. 57, illustrates client problems while on the job. Six clients indicated difficulty with other workers, i.e., rudeness or teasing. Eight respondents said

Table 13

Client Responses on Client Problems While on the Job

Problem	Number of Clients	% of Problem Responses
1. Client difficulty with employer or supervisor	8	21
2. Client difficulty producing work to standards	9	23
3. Client difficulty with other employees	6	16
4. Client difficulty with other social problems	6	16
5. Physical, mental or emotional difficulty	5	13
6. Had earlier problems but overcame them	3	7
7. Needed spelling and reading skills	1	2
8. Absenteeism (although able to work)	1	2
Total	39	100

they had trouble with their employer or supervisor. Nine had difficulty producing work to the standards required or being fast enough in their work. Five stated epileptic attacks and the emotional depression or anxiety as interfering with their performance, and five clients indicated other social problems such as "lacked confidence," "communication," personal hygiene or caring for oneself without the necessities to do so. One client had difficulty with absenteeism from work though able to work. One client said he needed "spelling and reading" skills. Three clients indicated they had had difficulty but not at present indicating a range of improvement and, therefore, increased success.

Ninety-five percent of responding clients indicated they have the skills to do their job. Five percent said they did not. Twelve clients did not answer. Eighteen percent of clients said they had problems with their employer, supervisor, or other workers as indicated by Table 13, p. 57, and 82% indicated no problem with employer, supervisor, or other workers. Again 12 clients did not answer this question.

Regarding other problems not related to job skills or employer relationships, 24% of responding clients said yes they had other problems and 76% said no they did not. Fifteen clients did not answer this question. Table 14, p. 59, shows other problems not related to job skills as stated by responding clients.

Table 14

Client Problems Not Related to Job Skills or Employer Relationships as Indicated by Clients

Problem	Number of Clients	% of Question Responses
1. Transportation to and from work	7	30
2. Fear, anxiety, depression, emotional problems	6	26
3. Social barriers	4	16
4. Epileptic attacks, excessive fatigue, weight loss, or client not well	3	13
5. Job not steady	1	4
6. Psychotic episodes (controlled)	1	4
7. Desire to be another kind of worker	2	8
Total	24	100

Seven clients said transportation was a problem, six indicated fear, anxiety, depression, and emotional difficulties were a problem to their proper functioning. And four clients said social barriers were problematical. Four clients said their main work problems were lack of steady employment, psychotic episodes (though controlled), and desire to be some other kind of worker.

Client Return to Workshop for Further Services

One hundred and nine, or 95% of clients, responded to the question, "Have you returned to your workshop for any additional help?" Eighty-nine, or 82%, indicated they had not returned to the workshop setting. Twenty, or 18% said they had.

Ten respondents returned to workshops for additional training, and 15 returned for help to find different jobs according to client responses.

Five clients stated other reasons for returning to the workshop setting. One client was unhappy with two different part-time jobs, another client wanted a "steady job." One client wanted a better-paying position, and one client was dissatisfied being in a job for which he was not trained. The last client response indicated a total lack of incentive to be productive, and that he was afraid to work.

It should be noted that in addition to the foregoing

results, many clients, client's parents or guardian signed their name to the questionnaire though no identification was requested. Further, a number of questionnaires included written unsolicited responses by clients, parents, guardians and friends of both positive and negative nature regarding client workshop experiences. Finally, several responses were completed by disgruntled, disturbed or irrational clients. In such cases, the responses were treated objectively and unnecessary information deleted from the study.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study involved an investigation of workshops for the handicapped in Utah and an investigation of clients of those workshops with relation to skill training, job placement, and follow-up services. Two questionnaires were developed and utilized, one for workshop response and the other for client response, within a defined period of time.

The workshop questionnaire included five sections seeking information regarding client skill training, job placement, and follow-up services for fiscal years 1978 and through March of fiscal 1979. The instrument requested lists of clients served, placed and followed during calendar year 1978, and sought permission to survey clients, which was given in the case of each responding workshop. Fifteen of 16 workshops in Utah responded. The questionnaire also asked for and received information regarding client handicapping condition by frequency.

The client instrument included 10 questions about skill training, job placement and follow-up services provided clients by their workshops. In addition, the client questionnaire asked for information regarding client satis-

faction and problems.

The client questionnaire was mailed to 322 clients from lists provided by the 15 responding workshops. A total of 122 clients responded to the questionnaire. Forty-eight questionnaires were not delivered to clients for various reasons as indicated by the U. S. Postal Service and were returned to the researcher.

The purposes of the client questionnaire were (1) to allow for and take into consideration client input to services received, (2) to validate workshop data, and (3) to provide baseline client response data to the system for appropriate reference.

Summary of Workshop Findings

As shown by the data, a significant percentage of workshop clients and more than a majority of workshops were involved in job skill training. Also apparent is the fact that many workshop clients in almost half of Utah's workshops were involved in work activity, work adjustment, and work evaluation. The data indicate that those in work activity increased in 1979. Important also is the consideration that a higher percentage of those clients in the researcher's assigned category "20" remained within their workshop setting and were engaged in some kind of production or semi-production for their workshop out of client need and limited potential for the competitive work market. The largest groups in skill training for competitive work

were in Trade and Industrial, Distributive and Health Occupation areas of training on a descending scale. Considerably fewer workshops reported clients in the remaining major job code areas and the workshops appeared to not be training clients in several job code areas.

Few workshop clients were under the age of 16. More than one-third of clients were involved in skill training programs for competitive employment during both fiscal years studied. Significant percentages of trained clients were placed on a job relating to their skill training area. High percentages of clients placed were still on the job during the study according to workshop information.

Some clients returned to a workshop setting for additional services as indicated by the data, and a majority of workshops had job placement and job development personnel on staff.

Average follow-up calls on clients, client's family and employer ranged widely from very few to an inordinate number for responding workshops, both fiscal years studied. Understanding of what constituted "average" calls on clients appeared to be a problem. Far fewer follow-up calls were made on client's family or guardian than upon clients and employers.

Workshop placement officers and "other" staff provided a large percentage of follow-up services, according to workshops. Several workshops indicated their rehabilita-

tion counselor followed through.

A large majority of learning handicapped emerged in the study as workshop participants. Clients with mobility, paroxysmal, and manipulative dexterity handicaps followed in respective order. Those clients with sensory/communicative, energy, and other handicaps were fewer in number. Those working with the blind were singular in their use of the "other" category in this section.

Placement in the work market of clients by workshops and Office of Education major job codes showed fairly even distribution between Trade and Industrial and Distributive placements. Placement into Health Occupations follows closely, then considerably fewer numbers of clients placed in the other Office of Education job categories.

With regard to workshop commitment to the study, responding workshops indicated strong interest and followed through with the information requested.

Summary of Client Findings

One-half of the responses came from two workshops, and more than two-thirds of responding clients were served by four workshops. Seventy-five percent of responding clients were served by five workshops. There were few responses from clients of six workshops, and no responses from clients of three workshops.

A majority of responding clients said they were trained for a specific job by their workshop. Larger percent-

ages were trained through on-the-job and in both the classroom and work setting modes.

Almost one-half of responding clients said they were trained in Trade and Industrial areas. Fewer than one-quarter received training in Distributive occupations, and less were involved in Health occupations training. These three occupational categories together account for 84% of client training. Fourteen percent of clients indicated they were not trained for any specific job.

Workshop staff placed more clients than did rehabilitation counselors, according to clients. However, both categories accounted for more than three-quarters of placements, and "other" kinds of people were involved in the placement of clients at a significantly higher rate than was Job Service.

Though almost half of responding clients indicated training in Trade and Industrial occupations, about one-quarter of the respondents indicated working for a Trade and Industrial employer. Somewhat less than one-quarter of clients said they were working in a Health Occupational setting and about one-fifth were working for a Distributive type employer. About one-fifth the respondents said they were not working.

Variances in client responses were noted in the area of working or not working at the time of the survey. Fewer than three-quarters of clients said they were still

working. More than one-quarter said they were not working in contrast to the prior response.

When asked what their current job was at the time of the survey fewer than one-half indicated jobs that were Trade and Industrial in nature, and more than one-quarter of respondents indicated a Distributive type job. In the third largest category were Health occupations. However, 11% wrote in no job, and 21 clients did not answer. Some "no answers" would appear actually to be "no job" in nature and, therefore, no response.

In terms of follow-up services, a majority of clients indicate that they have been contacted by workshop personnel or others in relation to their work. However, about one-third said they have not been contacted, and 26 clients did not respond to this question.

Family or guardian contact in behalf of clients was considerably less than client and employer contact with 42% indicating no contacts made. Some of these clients, however, may not have been aware of actual parent or guardian contact by their workshops as earlier indicated. More than one-third of the clients indicated 1-3 calls were made upon parent or guardian, and one-fifth said 4-9 calls had been made. Eighteen clients did not respond. Some of these clients may not have been aware of parent or guardian calls.

Employer contacts varied from more than one-third no contact to 1-9 calls for two-thirds of respondents. How-

ever, 40 clients did not respond here indicating again some unawareness of employer contact by their workshop or others.

A high range of client job satisfaction was registered by clients though about one-fifth indicated dissatisfaction. More than one-third of the respondents said they had problems while less than two-thirds indicated no problem. The problems ranged from social to lacking ability to do the job. Yet a high percentage felt they had necessary skills for their job. Some clients have difficulty with their employer, supervisor, or other workers and about one-quarter of clients have problems not related to job skills or employer'employee relationships such as transportation to and from work, desire for different work or not sufficient pay.

More than four-fifths of clients have not had the need to return to a workshop setting as indicated by clients. Yet, about one-fifth have had that need for additional training, to find a different job, or for other reasons, such as increased social skills.

Conclusions and Implications

The extent of workshop participation and cooperation was excellent in terms of this study. In the case of clients, the response rate of those in receipt of the client questionnaire was good when compared to other client mail-out surveys as indicated by Utah rehabilitation personnel. The response of clients depended on actual receipt of the

questionnaire, and the ability and interest to respond. Response also depended upon the interest and follow-through of parent, guardian or friend.

While more than one-third of clients were involved in skill training programs, a significant percentage of clients were involved in work activity, work adjustment, or evaluation areas. There are job skill training programs in most of Utah workshops, however, the design of some Utah workshops is such that job skill training is not yet important for their clients, and other more basic skills need to be achieved before addressing employment skills. In fact, several workshops in Utah are terminal in nature because of severity of client handicapping conditions and the improbability of client potential for the competitive work market. Yet, these workshop clients are involved in workshop contract production and are being compensated to some extent for their work.

Very few clients under 16 years of age are involved in Utah workshops. Job placement of clients relating to training were less than 50% according to workshop response. Yet, 87% of clients in skill training programs were trained in a specific job according to client responses.

Although the workshops indicated a high to very high percentage of placed clients still on the job for both years of the study, clients indicated considerably fewer on the job during the period of the client survey.

Workshop and client responses regarding client returns to the workshop for additional services were equal. One-third of clients returning to workshops indicated several problems according to the data: (1) incomplete training for client success, (2) clients not trained or placed in jobs to their liking, (3) clients unprepared socially to make the needed adaptation to work.

Though a high percentage of clients received follow-up services according to workshop responses, client data indicates otherwise. More than one-third of clients said they have not been contacted regarding their work. The workshops indicated all client families had received follow-up calls, yet client data showed 42% of clients saying no calls were made upon their families (or guardian).

As was earlier indicated some clients may not have been aware of family contacts for several reasons. However, there appears to be considerable discrepancy between what the workshops and their clients are saying. The same is true for calls upon client's employer according to the data. Though workshops report a range of from 2-104 calls upon client employers, 37% of clients said no calls were.

A high percentage of workshop clients as reported by the workshops are in the learning handicapped category, for example, mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed. Fifteen workshops reported 61% of clients in this category. One conclusion and implication to be drawn from this data

is that for the most part, this category of clients can not cope with regular school programs, secondary or post-secondary, adult and others, because of their handicapping problems. Another conclusion and implication is that regular programs are not designed for the learning disabled, nor can regular program people cope with the learning disabled because, if for no other reason, they are not trained to do so.

Job training and placement into the job market is taking place in Trade and Industrial, Distributive and Health occupations but little or no training and placement of clients in other major job code areas. Also apparent is the level at which trained and placed clients are working. According to the data, a large number of clients are in jobs which require minimal skills. For example, clients in Trade and Industrial occupations are in jobs such as building maintenance, custodial or auto-detailing. Those in Distributive jobs are typically involved in occupations such as bus boy, unloading trucks or hotel-motel housekeeping. Those involved in Health occupations are also at the low end of the scale such as nurse aides and orderlies.

Recommendations

The researcher makes the following recommendations in relation to this study and the conclusions and implications:

1. Because of the depth and scope of this study,

no effort was made to survey employers of the Utah handicapped. Such a study could provide data which would validate or otherwise impinge upon workshop and client feedback. Such an effort would also allow employers feedback to programs.

2. This study, once more, pointed up the fact that client surveys are difficult, at best. Many clients do not, can not, or otherwise will not respond. A study is suggested for the Utah handicapped which could, perhaps, highlight problems and seek answers to, among other important questions, the response-ability of clients depending upon handicapping conditions. Other questions are family or guardian support to the client, and the difficulty clients face with receiving and responding to mail. A further study of client motivation to become transient or the reasons for being transient would be important.

3. An in-depth research of Utah clients of workshops who are in work activity modes by and large should be undertaken. Initiatives for these clients could be explored, for training and placement into the competitive work market or for other more productive involvement.

4. The rate of compensation received by clients who are working within the workshops, producing largely for contract fulfillment, should be studied. Appropriate recommendations should be made for more equitable client compensation as appropriate.

5. Further inquiry into client recidivism needs to be undertaken. The "why" of recidivism as well as a look at "returns to workshop" as possibly a positive process in client rehabilitation should be explored.

6. An in-depth study of Utah client follow-up services should be conducted. Follow-up services are viewed by many as being of prime importance to client success. Such an effort should include follow-up services that involve clients, client's family or significant others, and the client's employer.

7. Teacher training in working with the handicapped should be provided for all the teachers in Utah if we are to succeed to any degree to mainstreaming the handicapped. Such teacher training could involve two approaches: one as a regular part of college or university teacher training, the other as a continuing education concept which could include in-service and situational modes.

8. Initiatives should be undertaken in vocational education in Utah to: (a) provide equal access into training programs whether in a regular program or alternative efforts, for all of Utah's handicapped, insofar as this is possible by client handicapping condition; (b) help insure job opportunities for the trained handicapped in all major job code areas; (c) provide for upward or horizontal mobility of all handicapped seeking training, retraining, or additional training, and to help provide for

upward job mobility; (d) insure that all vocational educators, regardless of level of responsibility, are ombudsmen for the handicapped, and proponents of equity for those who seek empathy, not sympathy, and the right to succeed to the level of their ability.

APPENDIX A

WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Directors of Utah Sheltered Workshops for the Handicapped

FROM: Keith Tracy, Ph.D., Chairman for the Vocationally Handicapped

DATE: February 16, 1979

SUBJECT: Attached Workshop Client Survey

This memorandum follows our recent telephone conversation during which we discussed the strong need for base line data regarding job skill training, job placement and follow-up services to handicapped clients to insure job success.

You indicated strong interest in providing this information with relation to your workshop. We appreciate your willingness to do this.

Will you please complete the attached three-page client survey as soon as possible and return them to my office by the end of the first week of March, Friday, March 9.

Please pay particular attention to the information requested on the bottom of page three. Note that the list of names and addresses of clients should be prepared for calendar year 1978. The balance of the instrument relates to fiscal year 1978-79 to date. I will mail a brief survey to your clients to ascertain their rate of job success and satisfaction. We will, of course, maintain confidentiality and we will share the client's feedback with you.

Thank you for your assistance in this effort.

RF

enclosure

Name of Center or District _____ Date Received ___

INFORMATION REQUEST FOR USE IN EVALUATING
SHELTERED WORKSHOP PROGRAMS FOR THE
VOCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED IN UTAH

Please complete the following information request prior to a visit by the Researcher. The information sought relates to the VOCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED of your workshop.

By Federal law, "Vocationally Handicapped" means those individuals who are not succeeding or cannot succeed in ongoing vocational programs because of physical or mental handicapping conditions. The information you furnish will serve as baseline data from which progress for the vocationally handicapped can be determined.

I. CLIENT INVOLVEMENT BY TRAINING CATEGORY (16 years or older):

	Numbers Involved	
	FY 1978	FY 1979 to date
A. Auto Detailing		
B. Hotel/Motel Maintenance		
C. Custodial Maintenance		
D. Extended Care Nursing		
E. Medical (other) _____		
F. Other (please state by category) _____		
_____		
_____		

Our workshop does not have job skill training programs _____

II. CLIENT FOCUSED "OUTPUT" RESULTS (16 years or older) Total clients who were served by your program from July 1, 1977, to present:

	FY 1978	FY 1979 to date
A. Total clients enrolled (all ages and categories)		
B. Total clients enrolled (16 or older)		
C. Total clients in skill training programs		
D. Number of job placements (related to skill training)		

	FY 1978	FY 1979 to date
E. Number of placed clients still on the job		
F. Number of clients placed but returned for additional services		

Does your workshop have trained Placement and Job Development Personnel (staff)? Yes ___ No ___

III. CLIENT FOCUSED FOLLOW-UP SERVICES (16 years or older). Indicate number of clients who received follow-up services by your workshop staff.

	FY 1978	FY 1979 to date
A. Total clients receiving follow-up services		
B. Total clients over 16 years and placed receiving follow-up services		
C. Average number of calls on placed clients		
D. Average number of calls on client's family		
E. Average number of calls on client's employer		
F. Total follow-up calls on clients, families, and employers		

Who provides follow-up services on your staff?
Placement Officer _____ Rehabilitation Counselor _____ Other _____

IV. CATEGORIES OF HANDICAPPED (16 years or older)

Mental or Physical Handicapping Categories	Numbers in Your Workshop	
A. Learning handicap (inability to adequately modify behavior as a function of past experience, i.e., mentally retarded or emotional disturbed		

	Numbers in Your Workshop
B. Sensory-communicative handicap--a deficit in sensory and/or speech ability which interferes with job performance (deafness)	
C. Mobility handicap--inability to ambulate or transport oneself which interferes with job performance and/or getting to and from work, i.e., paraplegic, blind, mentally retarded	
D. Energy handicap--a deficit of physical energy or work tolerance which interferes with job performance	
E. Manipulative dexterity handicap--inability to adequately perform minute and/or gross tasks involving finger-hand-eye coordination	
F. Paroxysmal handicap--temporary periods where a person loses contact with his environment, i.e., epilepsy or emotional disturbance	
G. Other (please state)	
_____	
_____	
_____	

V. WHERE HAVE CLIENTS BEEN PLACED IN THE WORK MARKET?

	Numbers	
	FY 1978	FY 1979 to Date
A. Local business (give examples) _____		
_____		
_____		
B. Local industry (give examples) _____		
_____		
_____		

	FY 1978	FY 1979 to Date
C. Local health care systems (give examples) _____		
_____		
_____		
D. Other		
_____		
_____		
_____		

Are you willing to provide back-up documentation that will support your responses in Sections I through V of this information request? (Yes) _____ (No) _____

Will you provide the researcher with a list of names and phone numbers of your clients who are in the work market, trained and/or placed by your workshop during the calendar year 1978? (Please attach the list to this survey instrument when you return.) (Yes) _____ (No) _____

May I contact a sample of these clients to ascertain their rate of satisfaction and success? I will share all information with you. (Yes) _____ (No) _____

Completed by Whom:

_____ _____
Name Date

_____
Title

APPENDIX B

CLIENT QUESTIONNAIRE

February 26, 1979

Dear Client:

You have recently received Training and Job placement services through the _____.
(Name of the workshop or center)

We need to receive from you important information on the client survey questionnaire which is attached. We have asked such things as what kind of job skill training you received, where you are currently working, and how well you are doing in your job.

We are asking clients across the state who have been in a workshop setting for the same information in order to better assist you and others in your efforts to become self-productive.

Will you please complete the attached survey as soon as possible and return it to the address below no later than March 30, 1979. You will find attached a self-addressed envelope which requires no postage. If you need assistance in filling out this questionnaire, will you ask a member of your family, your guardian, or a friend to help you. Thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Keith M. Tracy

Keith M. Tracy, Ph.D.
Chairman of the State
Committee for the
Vocationally Handicapped

Utah State Board of Education
250 East 500 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

KMT:rf

Enclosures

UTAH WORKSHOP CLIENT SURVEY

Job Skill Training, Job Placement and Follow-Up Services

1. Were you trained for a specific job in _____ (Name of workshop)? Yes ___ No ___

2. Were you trained for a specific job through on-the-job training? Yes ___ No ___

   A. Were you trained in both the classroom and work setting? Yes ___ No ___

3. What specific job were you trained for? _____

   _____

4. Who helped you to get a job? A. Workshop Staff ___. B. Rehabilitation Counselor ___. C. Job Services ___. D. Others _____

5. Where are you working? _____ (Name of business or industry) _____ Where located (city or town)

6. Are you still working? Yes ___ No ___

   Where? _____

   What is your current job? _____

7. Has someone from _____ (name of workshop) contacted you about how you are doing on your job?

   A. How many times has your family or guardian been contacted about your work? Number ___

   B. How many times has your employer been contacted about your work performance by your workshop or

rehabilitation counselor? Number of times ___

8. Are you happy in your work? Yes ___ No ___. If not--why? _____

9. Have you had any problems while on the job? Yes ___ No ___. What kind of problems have you had? _____

_____

A. Do you have the skills to do the job? Yes ___ No ___

B. Do you have problems with your employer, supervisor, or other workers? Yes ___ No ___. Explain if yes: _____

_____

C. Other problems not related to job skills or employer relationships? Yes ___ No ___. Explain the problem: _____

_____

10. Have you returned to your workshop for any additional help? Yes___ No___. Why? (Indicate below if yes):

☐ A. Additional training.

☐ B. To find a different job.

☐ C. To take a job within _____workshop.

☐ D. Other reasons for returning to the workshop. Explain: _____

_____

REFERENCES

Bitter, J. A. Toward a concept of job readiness. Rehabilitation Literature, 1968, 29, 201-203.

Criswell, J. H. Consideration on the permanence of psychiatric rehabilitation. Rehabilitation Literature, June, 1968, 29, 162-168.

Dawis, R. The Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 1967, 11, 1-10.

Deno, E. A school of rehabilitation follow-up. In H. B. Cobb (Ed.). The forecase of fulfillment: A review of research on predictive assessment of the adult retarded for social and vocational adjustment. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press, 1972.

Doane, R. C., & VAlente, M. E. The role of job coaching in vocational rehabilitation. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1977, 43, Nov.-Dec., 45.

Gellman, W. The principles of evaluation. Rehabilitation Literature, 1968, 29, 98-102.

Gellman, W., & Friedman, S. B. The workshop as a clinical rehabilitation tool. Rehabilitation Literature, 1965, 26, 34-38.

Gibson, D. Influencing employability of the developmentally handicapped. Final Report: Local Initiative Project of the Canadian Government. Calgary: Vocational and Rehabilitation Research Institute, 1973, 1355.

Hamilton, K. W. Counseling the handicapped in the rehabilitation process. New York: The Ronald Press, 1950.

Hardy, R. E. Vocational placement. In J. G. Cull & R. E. Hardy (Eds.). Vocational rehabilitation: Profession and process. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1972.

Jarrell, G. R. Selective training. In J. G. Cull & R. E. Hardy (Eds.). Vocational rehabilitation: Profession and process. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1972.

Keate, V. J. An analysis of a client satisfaction questionnaire developed by the Utah Division of Rehabilitation Services. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1977.

Lane, P. A., Soares, L. M., & Silverstone, L. S. Vocational rehabilitation: A therapeutic pre-vocational skill training program. Bridgeport, Conn.: Antoniaic Printing, 1970.

Lofquist, L. H., & Davis, R. V. Adjustment to work: A psychology of man's problems in a work-oriented society. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

McGowan, J. F., & Porter, T. L. An introduction to the rehabilitation process: A training manual. Washington, D.C.: Rehabilitation Services Administration, 1967.

Ninth Institute on Rehabilitation Services. Placement and follow-up in vocational rehabilitation process. Washington, D.C.: Rehabilitation Services Administration, 1972.

Osipow, S. H. Theories of career development. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Rusalem, H., & Malikin, D. Contemporary vocational rehabilitation. New York: New York University Press, 1976.

Salomone, P. R. A client-centered approach to job placement. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1971, 19, 266-270.

Sinick, D. Occupational information and guidance. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1970.

Sinick, D. The job placement process. In H. Rusalem & D. Malikin (Eds.). Contemporary vocational rehabilitation, New York: New York University Press, 1976.

Sinick, D. Vocational counseling trends in rehabilitation settings. Journal of Rehabilitation, July-Aug., 1977, 43, 19-21.

Sink, J. Trends in rehabilitation. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1977, 43, March-April, 36-40.

Thompson, N. Z. Experimental evaluative instrument based on standards for sheltered workshops recommended by The National Institute on Workshop Standards. Washington, D.C.: National Institute on Workshop Standards, 1960, 5.

Thompson, N. Z. (Ed.). The role of the workshop in rehabilitation: A report of The National Institute on the Role of the Workshop in Rehabilitation. Bedford, Penn., April 15-18, 1968. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Sheltered Workshops and Homebound Programs, 1968.

Thoreson, R. W. Disability viewed in its cultural context. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1964, 30(1), 12-13.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, & Welfare, Rehabilitation Services Administration. An introduction to the vocational rehabilitation process. J. F. McGowan & T. C. Porter (Eds.). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967. Rehabilitation Service Series No. 68-32.

U. S. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Workshops for the disabled: A vocational rehabilitation resource. E. L. Clouinard & J. F. Garrett (Eds.). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1956. Rehabilitation Service Serial No. 371, p. 7.

Weiss, D. J., Davis, R. V., Lofquist, L. H., & England, G. W. Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation. University of Minnesota: Industrial Relations Center (beginning in 1957).

Zytowski, D. G. Vocational behavior. New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston, 1968.

VITA

Name	Keith Marvin Tracy
Birthdate	August 24, 1926
Birthplace	Peoria, Illinois
High School	Peoria Central High
University	University of Delaware Newark, Delaware B.S., Physical Education June, 1950
	University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah M.S., Educational Administration June, 1966
	University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah Ph.D., Educational Administration August, 1968
	University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah 1977-1979
Professional Positions	Medical Dept. Representative, United States Navy and Marine Corps 1958-1968
	Program Manager, Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program Navy and Marine Corps Washington, D.C. 1968-1971
	Master Planner, Office of Comprehensive Health Planning State of Utah 1971-1972

Professional Positions
(Continued)

Health Science Officer, and
Director of Alcohol and Drug
Addiction Units
V.A. Hospital
Salt Lake City, Utah
1972-1973

State Specialist for Health
Occupations Education--State
Specialist for the Vocation-
ally Handicapped
State Board of Education
Salt Lake City, Utah
1973-1979